regularly bought and sold. The price of his resignation had already been fixed, and the chair, thus to be vacated, had been promised to Dr Stuart, when the negociation was finally interrupted by a strong remonstrance from the prin­cipal ; who might safely represent to the lord advocate that the habits of the candidate were not sufficiently academical, and that such an appointment would be highly unsatisfactory to himself, as well as to some of his colleagues. “ While engaged in some of his studies and projected publications,” we are informed, “ he has been known to confine himself for many weeks to solitary literary labour, hardly ever stir­ring abroad for air and exercise ; but he unfortunately in­dulged in occasional sallies of vastly too great latitude and even licentiousness.”@@1

This professorship was founded by the crown in the year 1707. The salary, payable out of the tithes of the bishop­ric of Edinburgh, amounted in 1802 to about L.350 ; but it was then reduced so low as L.80 or L.90, by an augmen­tation of stipend adjudged to the minister of St Cuthbert’s. As an indemnity for this reduction, the professor obtained in 1806 a pension of E.200, payable during his incumbency. He had “ purchased his commission,” and he never read a single lecture. He survived till the year 1831, and no suc­cessor has been appointed. A middle way might certainly have been found between the conduct of one administration and that of another. The number of lucrative offices in this university is not superabundant, nor was it necessary to reduce their number by so minute a fragment of public economy. Even on the admission of the chair having been inefficient, this treatment, unless extended to some better- endowed universities, can scarcely be regarded as impar­tial. The professorship of the civil law at Oxford has long been as inefficient as the professorship of public law at Edinburgh. Why should the one be suppressed, and the other spared ?

His qualifications for the office which thus seemed to be within his reach, were very eminent ; and this signal dis­appointment of his hopes proved the greatest misfortune of his life. His resentment against Dr Robertson appears to have suggested all the works in which he afterwards engag­ed. This spirit is very easily to be discerned in his next publication, “Observations concerning the Public Law and the Constitutional History of Scotland: with occasional Re­marks concerning English Antiquity.” Edinb. 1779, 8vo. His extensive researches for the View of Society must evi­dently have abridged his labour of preparing these Obser­vations, which contain much disquisition of a similar kind. The work is able and elaborate, nor can it be safely over­looked by any student anxious to investigate the constitu­tional history of our country. His antipathy to Robertson is unequivocally displayed in many passages ; and, at the conclusion, he thus concentrates his sentiments of dispa­ragement : “ A propensity to embellish other men’s notions, without considering enough on what authority they are founded, how strong they are in themselves, and what in­ferences are to be deduced from them, is a constant and a teeming source of mistake to this showy and elegant histo­rian. It is thence that he holds out many a frail opinion to glitter and to perish. To collect these cannot be interesting to me. But, though I could not submit to make a chronicle of his errors, I have been induced to wipe away, and to dis­pel, in part, the stains and the gloom they would fix upon our story, and to illustrate, by examples, the respect which is due to his authority. And, while I perform this service to truth, to liberty, and to our national antiquities, I disdain to be un­just, and am far from being insensible to the peculiarities of his merit. It must be a pain, I know, to many of his readers, that the most widely amusing of all our writers, is not at the same time the best informed, and the most able. They must regret that a work which forms so general, so easy, and so pleasing a pastime, is not also fraught with in­struction, and loaded with wisdom ; and that the author, who is deservedly so eminent in all the arts of courtly and popular composition, is not likewise remarkable for those superior qualities, which alone can secure and establish admiration, the power of thought, and the originality of sentiment.” It is scarcely necessary for us to subjoin, that we are very far from being disposed to acquiesce in this general estimate.

This publication was speedily followed by “ The History of the Establishment of the Reformation of Religion in Scotland.” Loud. 1780, 4to. The work is written with his usual ability, but it cannot be affirmed that such an undertaking was peculiarly adapted to his habits of think­ing. He however displays a greater degree of impartiality than could well have been anticipated. He is willing to admit that “ a tribute of the highest panegyric and praise is justly to be paid to the actors in the Reformation. They gave way to the movements of a liberal and a resolute spirit. They taught the rulers of nations that the obedience of the subject is the child of justice, and that men must be go­verned by their opinions and their reason. Their magna­nimity is illustrated by great and conspicuous exploits; which, at the same time that they awaken admiration, are an example to support and animate virtue in the hour of trial and peril. The existence of civil liberty was deeply connected with the doctrines for which they contended and fought. While they treated with scorn an abject and cruel superstition, and lifted and sublimed the dignity of man, by catling his attention to a simpler and wiser theology, they were strenuous to give a permanent security to the political constitution of their state.”

Of this work, his next publication may be considered as the sequel : “ The History of Scotland, from the Establish­ment of the Reformation till the Death of Queen Mary.” Lend. 1782, 2 vols. 4to. Here the author has made a great, and indeed a splendid effort, to eclipse the reputation of Robertson, whom he both envied and hated. As the one historian considered Mary guilty of some of the foulest crimes laid to her charge, it was almost an obvious conse­quence that the other should represent her as innocent. Her innocence, he is willing to believe, has been demon­strated by Goodall and Tytler; but more recent writers, and especially Laing, have sufficiently disposed of their de­monstrations ; nor is it perhaps to be anticipated that any historian of eminence will hereafter desert the footsteps of Robertson to tread in those of Stuart. His work however displays great vigour of mind, and the style is more easy and flowing than that of his View of Society. Some of his characters are sketched with a powerful pencil. This his­tory attracted no inconsiderable share of public attention on its first appearance, and, like his preceding volume, it reached a second edition, but it made little or no progress in supplanting the rival work ; and the story of the ill-fated Mary’s crimes and sufferings still continues to be chiefly read in the elegant and captivating pages of Robertson.

The preface to the History of Scotland is dated at Lon­don on the first of March 1782 ; and soon after this period, he undertook the management of the English Review, the property of the late John Murray, who had been the Lon­don publisher of his Magazine. Of “ The English Review, or, an Abstract of English and Foreign Literature,” the first number appeared at the commencement of the year 1783. One of his coadjutors was Whitaker, an uncandid and virulent critic, whose chief effort in this journal was a series of articles on Gibbon’s History.@@5 These he reprinted

@@@, Kerr's Memoirs of Smellie, vol. i. p. 500.

@@@’ D'Israeli states that “ he negociated for Whitaker and himself a doctor of laws degree." (Calamities of Authors, vol. ii. p. 63.) This